

State in families with incomes below the poverty line, according to the most recently available Census data, if—

“(i) the illegitimacy ratio of the State for the most recent fiscal year for which such information is available is at least 1 percentage point lower than the illegitimacy ratio of the State for fiscal year 1995 (or, if such information is not available, the first available year after 1995 for which such data is available); and

“(ii) the rate of induced pregnancy terminations for the same most recent fiscal year in the State is not higher than the rate of induced pregnancy terminations in the State for fiscal year 1995 (or, the same first available year); or

“(B) an amount equal the product of \$50 multiplied by the number of children in the State in families with incomes below the poverty line, according to the most recently available Census data, if—

“(i) the illegitimacy ratio of the State for the most recent fiscal year for which information is available is at least 2 percentage points lower than the illegitimacy ratio of the State for fiscal year 1995 (or, if such information is not available, the first available year after 1995 for which such data is available); and

“(ii) the rate of induced pregnancy terminations in the State for the same most recent fiscal year is not higher than the rate of induced pregnancy terminations in the State for fiscal year 1995 (or, the same first available fiscal year).

“(2) DETERMINATION OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall not increase the grant amount under paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that the relevant difference between the illegitimacy ratio of a State for an applicable fiscal year and the illegitimacy ratio of such State for fiscal year 1995 or, where appropriate, the first available year after 1995 for which such data is available, is the result of a change in State methods of reporting data used to calculate the illegitimacy ratio or if the Secretary determines that the relevant non-increase in the rate of induced pregnancy terminations for an applicable fiscal year as compared to fiscal year 1995 or the appropriate fiscal year is the result of a change in State methods of reporting data used to calculate the rate of induced pregnancy terminations.

“(3) ILLEGITIMACY RATIO.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘illegitimacy ratio’ means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year—

“(A) the number of out-of-wedlock births that occurred in the State during the most recent fiscal year for which such information is available; divided by

“(B) the number of births that occurred in the State during the most recent fiscal year for which such information is available.

“(4) POVERTY LINE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘poverty line’ has the meaning given such term in section 403(a)(3)(D)(iii).

“(5) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—There are authorized to be appropriated and there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000 for the purpose of increasing the amount of the grant payable to a State under section 403(a)(1) in accordance with this subsection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DASCHLE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. There were 39 votes and there will be three more, so that is 42 votes before we complete action.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes at 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday—and we will be here Monday, but this is after the policy lunch Tuesday—the Senate proceed to 30 minutes of debate to be equally divided in the usual form, to be followed immediately by a vote on the Gramm amendment No. 2615, to be followed by a vote on the Dole modification, to be followed by adoption of the Dole amendment No. 2280, third reading and final passage of H.R. 4, as amended, with 2 minutes for debate between the second and third votes, to be equally divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. For the information of all Senators, at 2:15 p.m., there will be 30 minutes for debate, under the control of the leaders or their designees, for wrap-up statements with respect to the welfare bill, and then the Senate will proceed to three back-to-back votes on the Gramm amendment No. 2615, the Dole modification, and final passage of H.R. 4.

Mr. DASCHLE. If the majority leader will yield, just for the information of Senators, is it still the majority leader's intention to bring up the Agriculture appropriations bill on Monday?

Mr. DOLE. If there is no objection, we would like to proceed to that. In fact, I think I have it here. At the hour of 10 a.m. we will proceed to calendar No. 186, H.R. 1976, the Agriculture appropriations bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. The unanimous-consent agreement does include a reference to when votes will take place?

Mr. DOLE. Not prior to the hour of 5:15.

Again, candidly, I know some of our Senators have official business on Monday. So we are trying to accommodate their wishes. We are also trying to finish that bill by Tuesday. I have talked to Senator COCHRAN, the committee chairman. He believes it can be done. There is one particular amendment that will take 2 hours of debate on Tuesday morning, concerning chickens, chilled chickens. It is a matter involving three different States. Kansas is not one of them. It will be interesting.

I hope we can complete action on that following final action on the welfare bill. We had hoped to go to the State, Justice, Commerce Department appropriations bill today. I do not believe we can do that now. I assume we will take that up following the Agriculture bill.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1995

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 9:45 a.m. Monday, September 18, 1995; that following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be deemed approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their

use later in the day, that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to extend beyond 10 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER TO PROCEED TO H.R. 1976

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 10 o'clock the Senate proceed to calendar No. 186, H.R. 1976, the Agriculture appropriations bill, and that no votes occur on Monday prior to the hour of 5:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. For the information of all Senators, we are going to begin the Agriculture appropriations bill at 10. So we hope Members will offer amendments on Monday, and we can complete action by the lunch recess on Tuesday. Also, by previous consent, three roll-call votes will occur on Tuesday, at approximately 2:45, with respect to the welfare reform bill.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 3:30 p.m., and Members be permitted to speak for 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, it does not take a rocket scientist to be aware that the U.S. Constitution forbids any President to spend even a dime of Federal tax money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by Congress—both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

So when a politician or an editor or a commentator pops off that “Reagan ran up the Federal debt” or that “Bush ran it up,” bear in mind that the Founding Fathers, two centuries before the Reagan and Bush Presidencies, made it very clear that it is the constitutional duty of Congress—a duty Congress cannot escape—to control Federal spending.

Thus, it is the fiscal irresponsibility of Congress that has created the incredible Federal debt which stood at \$4,968,803,366,390.98 as of the close of business Thursday, September 14. This outrageous debt—which will be passed on to our children and grandchildren—averages out to \$18,861.66 for every man, woman and child in America.

COMMENDING OSEOLA McCARTY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise today to commend a Mississippi woman who is a role model for all Americans, Ms.

Oseola McCarty. Ms. McCarty, of Hattiesburg, has spent her life as a laundress. Due to her compassionate nature, she quit school in the sixth grade to take care of her ill aunt who was unable to take care of herself. At that time she began to wash and iron clothes for people in the Hattiesburg community and began to put money in the bank, dollar by dollar. But she was not thinking of herself. She only took one vacation as a young woman to Niagara Falls and, despite the heat of summer in Mississippi, she just recently purchased a window air-conditioning unit for the home she has lived in for most of her life. She only made the purchase at the insistence of her friends at the bank.

She is no longer able to iron clothes due to her arthritis, but she has given the University of Southern Mississippi \$150,000 in order to set up a scholarship for needy black students in her name so someone will have the education she had to give up. She made the statement, "I just want it to go to someone who will appreciate it and learn. I'm old and I'm not going to live always." She gave 60 percent of her savings to the university near her home. The business community in Hattiesburg is overwhelmed with her generosity and has come together to match her donation. Ms. Oseola McCarty has been recognized by local and national media alike, and I am proud to have this opportunity to share this remarkable story of generosity with everyone here today.

Not only should we commend Ms. McCarty, but also her community. At this time of budget cuts and welfare reform, we should use the people of Hattiesburg as a model for our future. Yes, it is going to be tough to bring our Nation to fiscal order, but if we all pool our efforts we can do great things for those who need help. Ms. McCarty lived a frugal existence so that she could give to others. What a wonderful example for us all.

THE PEACE INITIATIVE IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today both to congratulate the Clinton administration for having taken the lead in the search for peace in the former Yugoslavia and, at the same time, to offer words of caution, even warning.

Mr. President, Benjamin Franklin once wrote, "There never was a good war or a bad peace." These sentiments are indeed seductive, for no one who has seen the carnage of war could wish for anything more fervently than an end to the bloodletting.

Yet, for all his wisdom, Franklin was ultimately wrong. There are good wars. The American Revolution that gave birth to our country was but one example. And there are bad peace settlements. Most historians agree that the Versailles Treaty that ended World War I was fatally flawed and was one of

the fundamental causes of World War II.

The point obviously is that a good, sensible peace settlement that eliminates the root causes of conflict—or at least ameliorates the worst injustices—can prevent future war.

Conversely, a peace settlement unduly influenced by important, but secondary considerations such as perceived world opinion, a passionate yearning for an end to hostilities, or deference to sensibilities of allies or even enemies, all at the expense of hard realities, will only temporarily halt the fighting and postpone the attainment of a lasting peace.

Mr. President, it is profoundly unfortunate that for more than 4 years, two administrations abdicated this country's leadership in solving Europe's bloodiest crisis since 1945.

The dismal series of broken promises, aborted cease-fires, and ongoing atrocities in the former Yugoslavia attests to the stark fact that unless the United States takes the lead, no foreign and security problem will be solved in Europe. I do not say this to brag; this is a simple fact echoed by many Europeans.

So I applaud President Clinton for having broken the Balkan logjam this summer through an energetic combination of military action and diplomacy.

Let us recall, however, that in this effort we have paid a grievous price. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the memory of three immensely talented and patriotic Americans—Joseph Kruzell, Robert Frasure, and Nelson Drew—who last month gave their lives on the Mount Igman Road near Sarajevo in the pursuit of peace.

And now, thanks to the efforts of these men, and to the labors of Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke and his new team, we are on the brink of another Bosnian ceasefire. This one is being praised:

For having secured a promised withdrawal of Bosnian Serb heavy weapons around Sarajevo and for opening land and air routes into the city—in return for a halt in the NATO bombing campaign.

For thereby having prevented a split in the Atlantic Alliance that reportedly was developing because of the bombing campaign.

For having put a stop to a potentially dangerous confrontation with Russia.

For allowing a framework for a peace settlement to be fleshed out.

And yet, Mr. President, despite the apparent merits of this agreement and of the peace framework, I am worried.

I am worried precisely because I fear that too much attention has been given to secondary considerations at the expense of primary ones.

I am worried because fundamental principles appear to have been sacrificed for short-term gain.

In other words, I am worried that we may be seeing the beginnings of what Benjamin Franklin could not envis-

age—a bad peace that will inevitably lead to another bad war.

More specifically, I am worried that Assistant Secretary Holbrooke has misjudged the character of the Serbian strongman Milosevic and has unnecessarily and unwisely involved, or even considered involving, Russian troops in the most delicate aspect of the proposed agreement.

Finally, I fear that the administration has seriously overestimated the willingness of this Congress to support the emerging settlement with massive development aid and the commitment of American troops to the former Yugoslavia as peacekeepers.

The joint statement issued on September 8, in Geneva, despite vigorous denials by Assistant Secretary Holbrooke, manifestly abandons the ideal of a multiethnic, multireligious, democratic Bosnia.

Instead, the so-called Republika Srpska, of Karadzic and Mladic—two indicted war criminals—is accorded status equal to the legitimate Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, whose territory must be divided between the Pale Serbs and the Moslem-Croat federation. This, Mr. President, is a huge concession.

And what is gotten in return? The Bosnian Serbs agree to only 49 percent of the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This acceptance has been trumpeted as a major concession on their part, usually described as sacrificing one-third of the territory they currently occupy.

In actuality, however, it has been weeks since the Bosnian Serbs have controlled 70 percent of Bosnia and Herzegovina despite the persistence of the media in erroneously describing it as such.

At the time of the Geneva signing they controlled perhaps 62 percent; this week they lost another 6 or 7 percent.

In short, Mr. President, the military fortunes of the Bosnian Serbs have been on the wane. The NATO bombing campaign has contributed marginally to their difficulties by disrupting their communications, but the Bosnian Serbs' problems run much deeper.

The Serbs' capture of the supposedly safe U.N. areas of Srebrenica and Zepa in July was actually a desperate gamble by General Mladic and his Serbian patron Milosevic to halt their military reverses. The Bosnian Serb Army is outmanned and is plagued by rapidly sinking morale. In the west and north it has lost allies with the ouster of the Krajina Serbs by the Croatian Army.

The Bosnian Serb Army retains a strong base in Eastern Bosnia and, of course, the capability to indulge in its favorite maneuver, lobbying artillery and mortar shells at defenseless civilians, as shown by the latest massacre in the Sarajevo market.

So it is highly probable that within the near future the situation on the ground would have dictated a willingness of the Bosnian Serbs to sue for